

1 WO
2
3
4
5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8
9 Craig MacPhee,) No. CV 11-1310-PHX-JAT
10 Plaintiff,)
11 vs.) **ORDER**
12)
13 Lifecare Services; Friendship Village of)
14 Tempe,)
15 Defendants.)
_____)

16 On July 13, 2011, the Court issued the following order:

17 Inquiring whether the court has jurisdiction is a federal judge's first duty
18 in every case." *Belleville Catering Co. v. Champaign Market Place, L.L.C.*,
19 350 F.3d 691, 693 (7th Cir. 2003). In this case, the complaint fails to
20 sufficiently plead jurisdiction. Specifically, Plaintiff has failed to allege a
21 claim that arises under Federal law. See 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Further, to the
22 extent Plaintiff intended to plead diversity jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. § 1332, he
23 failed to allege the citizenship of Friendship Village of Tempe. He further
24 failed to allege the citizenship of Lifecare Services, L.L.C. *Johnson v. Columbia Properties Anchorage, L.P.*, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006)
(discussing the citizenship of a limited liability company).

25 Accordingly,

26 **IT IS ORDERED** that by August 12, 2011, Plaintiff shall file an amended
27 complaint properly alleging federal subject matter jurisdiction, or this case will
28 be dismissed without prejudice for lack of federal subject matter jurisdiction.

25 Doc. 7.

26 On August 3, 2011, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint claiming jurisdiction based
27 on diversity. Plaintiff also claimed that Defendant Lifecare Services, L.L.C. is a corporation.
28 Plaintiff attempted to plead the citizenship of Lifecare Services, L.L.C. based on *Hertz Corp.*

1 *v. Friend*, 130 S. Ct. 1181, 1192; - - - U.S. - - - (2010) (discussing the citizenship of a
2 corporation).

3 As the Court noted in the previous order, Defendant Lifecare Services, L.L.C. is a
4 limited liability company. The Court also cited two cases discussing the citizenship of a
5 limited liability company, which, unlike a corporation, is not based on a state of
6 incorporation or a principal place of business.

7 Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff will be given one last opportunity to amend his
8 complaint to fully allege federal subject matter jurisdiction. If the to-be-filed second
9 amended complaint fails to allege jurisdiction, this case will be dismissed without Plaintiff
10 being given any further opportunities to amend. Accordingly,

11 **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff shall file a second amended complaint by September
12 9, 2011, properly alleging federal subject matter jurisdiction, or this case will be dismissed
13 without prejudice.

14 DATED this 18th day of August, 2011.


James A. Teilborg
United States District Judge